

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-25, 27 and 29-33 are present in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 15 and 19 have been amended, and claim 28 has been cancelled. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

At the outset, Applicants extend their appreciation to Examiner Smith for his courtesy in conducting the interview with Applicants' representative on August 8, 2006. The substance of the interview described in the Interview Summary mailed August 15, 2006 is accurate. Applicants note that Examiner Smith agreed that any action responsive to this Amendment other than a Notice of Allowance would not be made final if submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination. Such a Request is submitted herewith, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-25, 27, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2001/0037373 to Cambridge. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed previously and during the interview with Examiner Smith, an important objective of the present invention is to facilitate a product purchase using a computer but without requiring access to the Internet. As discussed in the Amendment filed March 17, 2006, the system and method described in the Cambridge publication require access to the Internet in order to function as intended. Those remarks from the March 17 Amendment are hereby incorporated by reference.

In an effort to further clarify distinctions between the claimed invention and the Cambridge publication, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the purchase data is sufficient to complete the purchase of the item. Additionally, claim 1 recites that the first selection in the permitting step causes printing of an order form containing the purchase data and configured to initiate a purchase when physically delivered to a vendor. Support for this language can be found in the specification at, for example, page 2, lines 3-4; page 6, line 22 – page 7, line 5; and FIG. 9. Subject to further

consideration, Examiner Smith agreed that this language more clearly distinguishes the invention from the Cambridge publication.

Independent claim 12 has been similarly amended, reciting that the purchase data is sufficient to complete the purchase of the item, wherein the order form is printed with the purchase data. Independent claim 15 has been amended similar to claim 1, and independent claim 19 has been amended to recite that the purchasing data is sufficient to complete the purchase of the item.

As discussed previously and during the interview with Examiner Smith, the system and method described in the Cambridge publication require access to the Internet in order to function as intended. Since at least this subject matter is lacking in the Cambridge publication, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of these independent claims is misplaced.

With regard to the dependent claims, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim. Moreover, claims 8 and 14 recite that the method is completed without having accessed information related to the item not already contained by a removable data storage medium (claim 8) or the electronic storage medium (claim 14). In this context, the Office Action references paragraph [0067] in Cambridge. This paragraph in Cambridge, however, does not reference completing the method in the manner claimed. Rather, the additional items necessary to complete the method in Cambridge are obtained by executing the customer's Internet service provider software to establish a connection with the Internet. See paragraph [0068]. For these reasons also, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable over the Cambridge publication.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Cambridge in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,376 to Kenney, and claims 28, 29, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Cambridge in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,918,213 to Bernard et al. Applicants respectfully submit,

CALAWAY et al.  
Appl. No. 09/814,441  
September 7, 2006

however, that these references do not provide any suggestion to modify the Cambridge publication to correct those deficiencies noted above and discussed during the interview. As such, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable over the art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Prompt passage to issuance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Alan M. Kagen  
Reg. No. 36,178

AMK:jls  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100